



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,907	09/26/2003	Jeyhan Karaoguz	14829US02	9187

23446 7590 01/25/2006

MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD
500 WEST MADISON STREET
SUITE 3400
CHICAGO, IL 60661

EXAMINER

REVAK, CHRISTOPHER A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/672,907	Applicant(s) KARAOGUZ ET AL	
	Examiner Christopher A. Revak	Art Unit 2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 9/26/03 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground of rejection.
2. The objection to claim 8 is hereby withdrawn by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-4 and 7-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Colvin, U.S. Patent 6,044,471.

As per claim 1, it is disclosed by Colvin of a method for theft prevention of communications devices used in a communication network. A communication device deployed at a location that is communicatively coupled to the communication network is registered. After registering the communication device, validation information is received wherein the validation information is entered via the communication device. It is then determined whether the communication device is authorized for use in the communication network based on the validation information entered via the

Art Unit: 2131

communication device (col. 4, lines 33-54, col. 5, lines 14-27, and as shown in Figure 1).

As per claim 2, it is taught by Colvin wherein registering the communication device includes the device serial number (col. 2, line 63 through col. 3, line 3).

As per claim 3, Colvin discloses wherein receiving the validation information includes receiving the device serial ID number (col. 2, line 63 through col. 3, line 3).

As per claim 4, the teachings of Colvin recite of locking the communication device out of the communication network upon determination that the communication device is unauthorized (col. 5, lines 5-10).

As per claim 7, Colvin discloses of a system supporting theft prevention of communication devices used in a communication network. A processor communicatively coupled to the communication network, receives information related to the communication device. The processor receives validation information entered into the communications network via the communications device and determines whether the communication device is authorized for use in the communication network based on the received validation information (col. 4, lines 33-54, col. 5, lines 14-27, and as shown in Figure 1).

As per claim 8, Colvin teaches that the processor comprises a personal computer (col. 4, lines 33-35 and as shown in Figure 1).

As per claim 9, the disclosure of Colvin teaches of a system supporting theft prevention of communication devices used in a communication network. A communication device is deployed in a home environment. A communication network

Art Unit: 2131

communicatively coupled to the home environment receives validation information entered via the communication device and relates to the communication device. It is determined whether to grant the communication device access to the communication network, based on the validation information entered via the communication device (col. 4, lines 33-54, col. 5, lines 14-27, col. 6, lines 52-60, and as shown in Figure 1).

As per claim 10, it is taught by Colvin that the communication network comprises an Internet infrastructure (col. 6, lines 52-60 and col. 7, line 65 through col. 8, line 3).

As per claim 11, Colvin discloses that the communication network comprises the Internet (col. 7, line 65 through col. 8, line 3).

As per claim 12, the teachings of Colvin disclose that the communication network comprises a closed communication infrastructure (col. 6, lines 52-60 and col. 7, line 65 through col. 8, line 3).

As per claim 13, it is disclosed by Colvin that the authorization information includes a device serial ID number (col. 2, line 63 through col. 3, line 3).

As per claim 14, Colvin teaches that the communication device is a personal computer (col. 4, lines 33-35 and as shown in Figure 1).

As per claim 15, Colvin discloses of a system for supporting theft prevention of communication devices used in a communication network. A storage device residing in a first home environment and media device resides in a second home environment. A communication network communicatively coupled to the first home environment and the second home environment, the communication network analyzes validation information entered via the media device and determines whether to grant access of the media

Art Unit: 2131

device to the first home environment via the communication network, based on the validation information entered via the media device (col. 4, lines 33-54, col. 5, lines 14-27, col. 6, lines 52-60, and as shown in Figure 1).

As per claim 16, it is taught by Colvin wherein the communication network analyzes authorization information and determines whether to grant access of the media device to the storage device (col. 5, lines 14-27).

As per claim 17, it is disclosed by Colvin that the communication network comprises an Internet infrastructure (col. 6, lines 52-60 and col. 7, line 65 through col. 8, line 3).

As per claim 18, Colvin teaches that the communication network comprises the Internet (col. 7, line 65 through col. 8, line 3).

As per claim 19, the teachings of Colvin disclose that the communication network comprises a closed communication infrastructure (col. 6, lines 52-60 and col. 7, line 65 through col. 8, line 3).

As per claim 20, it is disclosed by Colvin that the authorization information includes a device serial ID number (col. 2, line 63 through col. 3, line 3).

As per claim 21, Colvin teaches that the communication device is a personal computer (col. 4, lines 33-35 and as shown in Figure 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2131

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colvin, U.S. Patent 6,044,471 in view of Ishikoff, U.S. Patent 5,748,084.

The disclosure of Colvin fails to teach of determining the location of the device and notifying an authority of the location of the communication device if it has been reported stolen. It is taught by Ishikoff et al determining the location of the device and notifying an authority of the location of the communication device if it has been reported stolen (col. 1, lines 59-65 and col. 3, lines 47-54). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to be able to locate a lost or stolen device. The teachings of Colvin recite of motivational benefits by reporting lost or stolen devices by disclosing the aiding in the retrieval of stolen devices by reciting it can expedite in the return of the stolen device and furthermore, can assist in the capture of the thief to act as a deterrent against theft (col. 2, lines 60-66). It would have been obvious that the combination of the teachings of Colvin et al would have been further secured against theft by applying the teachings of Ishikoff as a measure to aid in the retrieval of stolen devices.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher A. Revak whose telephone number is 571-272-3794. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 6:30am-3:00pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2131

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Christopher Revak
Primary Examiner
AU 2131

1/22/06

CR

January 22, 2006